



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/511,283

10/12/2004

Paul Girbig

1852

7590  
Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, NJ 08830

01/12/2009

EXAMINER

STERRETT, JONATHAN G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/12/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/511,283

**Applicant(s)**

GIRBIG, PAUL

**Examiner**

JONATHAN G. STERRETT

**Art Unit**

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9-12-08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Summary***

1. This **Final Rejection** is responsive to the preliminary amendment of 28 October 2008. Currently Claims 3-8 are pending in the application.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. The 35 USC 101 rejections are withdrawn.

### ***Response to Argument***

3. The applicants arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive

The applicant argues that the Germeraad fail to teach business process attributes.

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

Germeraad teaches managing an IP portfolio – this management is a business process. The various aspects being managed in the chart of Germeraad are thus business process attributes because they relate to the managing of the IP business process. The fact that that applicant's definition of "business process data" differs from what Germeraad teaches does not prevent Germeraad's "business process attributes" from reading on the claim language, according to a broadest reasonable definition of what a business process attribute is. The IP management process in Germeraad is a business process since IP management relates to the health of the business.

The examiner notes that the claimed invention is a combination of what is known in the art regarding the use of spider diagrams, the use of process control charts (e.g. X

bar and R charts used to indicate when a process is deviating from normal parameters) and the application of feedback control (i.e. in layman's terms – steering the process so that deviations from what are considered desirable or normal do not occur).

While spider diagrams or charts are not as frequently used as normal rectangular graphs (i.e. x-y charts), they are certainly known as a technique for displaying data in a compact form (including using shading to indicate an area under the curve on the spider diagram). Process control (i.e. measuring against a standard so that deviations can indicate something is wrong) is old and well known; as is feedback control - i.e. controlling a process through inputs such that those deviations shown in process control can be corrected.

The claimed combinations of limitations do not convey patentability because the different pieces claimed would be combinable by one of ordinary skill in the art - they are combinable in such a way as to be predictable - i.e. using process control applied to a spider chart with levers or inputs to control the process when it goes awry. A recent Supreme Court decision (KSR) cautioned against granting a patent based on a combination of elements shown to be in the prior art. It is the examiner's position that this is the case for the claimed invention, as outlined below.

The remaining arguments are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. **Claims 4, 6 and 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding **Claim 4**, the applicant has ended the claim with an "and". It is not clear if there are subsequent limitations intended. For the purposes of examination, the examiner assumes that there are no further limitations. **Claims 6 and 8** depend on **Claim 4** and inherit this deficiency.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 3-6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Paul Germeraad**, "Intellectual property in a time of change", Research Technology Management. Arlington: Nov/Dec 1999. Vol. 42, Iss. 6; p. 34 (6 pages) (hereinafter **Germeraad**) in view of **Klenz**, Bradley W; "The Quality Data Warehouse: Serving the analytical needs of the manufacturing enterprise", Milwaukee 1999, p.521, 9 pgs. ProQuest ID 53786375. (hereinafter **Klenz**).

Official Notice is taken of the following elements:

**Using computer systems, including hardware and software, to automate process steps, such as taught by Germeraad and Klenz (and Fowler below) are old and well known in the art.**

**Using computer graphic user interfaces is old and well known in the art.**

**The use of popup windows in these user interfaces to convey information is old and well known.**

**The use of a control element in a graphical user interface, including in a popup window, is old and well known.**

The combination of these elements with the measurement elements of Germeraad and Klenz (and below also with Fowler) would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention because adding these elements, known in the art of computing, would have provided a predictable result by providing a GUI with popups and controls. This combination with the teachings of Germeraad and Klenz (and Fowler below), would not destroy either the functionality of either the subject of the Official Notice or the combined teachings of the cited references.

Regarding **Claim 3**, Germeraad teaches:

3. A method for controlling a process flow, comprising:

**determining a plurality of ideal characteristic variables for the process flow that describe a sub-aspect of the process flow and define a desired target for each sub-aspect;**

**determining actual characteristic variables of the sub-aspects of the process flow at an observation time point and the actual state of the process flow in the observation time period is described by the actual characteristic variables;**

Page 35, Germeraad teaches the use of a radar diagram with sub aspects that measure various business process attributes.

**the actual points are graphically connected by connecting lines so that the area enclosed by the connecting lines is a measure of the quality of the process flow in the observation time period.**

Page 35, Klenz suggests using a radar diagram so that the points measured on the axes are connected to form an area.

Germeraad does not teach, but Klenz teaches

**determining a plurality of deviations of the actual characteristic variables from the corresponding ideal characteristic variables with the changes over time of the actual characteristic variables being included; and**

page 4 para 1-3, Klenz teaches the application of Statistical Process Control (i.e. Six Sigma methods) to measure variables in a process so that deviations can be tracked and corrected over time.

**representing the ideal characteristic variables as an optimum point in a display field of a visualization system and the actual characteristic variables are shown as an actual point at a distance from the optimum point and**

page 6 under data warehouse basics, Here Klenz suggests measuring various process capabilities (i.e. being in control of a process or not suggests that ideal characteristics of a process are charted – when those variable are out of control, Klenz suggests using SPC techniques to correct the deviations.

Klenz and Germeraad are addressing issues with how to manage the data that companies have in an efficient way. Both references teach where the multitude of data makes it difficult to efficiently measure what is going on in a firm.

Germeraad suggests the use of the Radar Diagram to efficiently capture and display data so that managers can see what is happening at a glance. Germeraad suggests this because of the wide amount of data that is available to measure.

Klenz teaches that companies can apply SPC techniques to efficiently measure and react to the vast amounts of data that is gathered. Klenz teaches that this data is more than just traditional manufacturing data, but can come from other parts of the organization (see page 1 para 1).

One of ordinary skill in the art would combine Germeraad with Klenz to achieve a predictable result by applying the statistical process control techniques of Klenz to the radar diagram of Germeraad to provide a radar diagram that provides overall process indicators to indicate when the business variables indicated on the radar diagram were out of control or not. The advantages would be providing a compact visual that



efficiently summarizes information and provides the benefit of also indicating statistical control, thus providing a predictable result.

Further, Germeraad teaches the need for companies to effectively manage and make decisions based on information that is presented in graphical format (i.e. a radar diagram). One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the radar diagram's graphical indications (e.g. one measure is lower on a scale than would be desired by management) provide a basis for making decisions by management by indicating where the organization is with respect to what is being measured.

Klenz teaches a quality data system that uses known tools to measure quality aspects, including the standard statistical process control charts. On page 2 para 10, Klenz states "To make enterprise-level quality decisions, data from these individual systems must be combined into meaningful information". The decisions Klenz is referring to underscores the understanding that one of ordinary skill in the art would have, that systems that measure some aspect of an organizational process, do so for the purpose of management to make decisions based on information those measurements provide. Implicit here is the recognition, also held by one of ordinary skill in the art, that a problem identified by these measurements (e.g. a process IP measurement in Germeraad that is unacceptable; or a quality measurement in Klenz that suggests a measurement is too high or low) requires a solution - management

exists to manage problems highlighted by the measurement systems taught by both Germeraad and Klenz.

Regarding **Claim 4**, Germeraad and Klenz do not teach performing the method with a device that comprises a storage area and a module with a display, However Official Notice is taken that performing method steps using a computer with a storage, processor and a display are old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to perform the method steps of Claim 3 using a computer because it would make the performing of the method faster and more efficient since it is being performed on a computer.

Regarding **Claims 5 and 7** Germeraad does not teach, but Klenz teaches suggesting a way to correct a deviation of a subaspect. On page 3 paragraph 6, Klenz teaches making "guided decisions" based on historical information – this suggests correcting a deviation of a subaspect.

8. **Claims 6 and 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Germeraad** in view of **Klenz** and further in view of:

"Feedback and feedforward as systemic frameworks for operations control"  
Alan **Fowler**. International Journal of Operations & Production Management. Bradford: 1999. Vol. 19, Iss. 2; pg. 182, (hereinafter **Fowler**).

Regarding **Claims 6 and 8**, Germeraad and Klenz teach the gathering and displaying of data for the purpose of enabling management decisions to improve the underlying process represented by the data. Klenz in particular suggests that analysis of historical data suggests how management can fix process problems using this analysis as a guide. however Germeraad and Klenz stop short of teaching the feedback control (i.e. providing a feedback control loop) for the purpose of enabling the process to be controlled.

Fowler suggests the use of feedback control to control processes – this suggests the use of a control to change and correct a variable that is being measured – see bottom of page 3/ top of page 4: here Fowler teaches the control of an input to control the same kind of business variables taught by Germeraad - i.e.a business process variables.

Thus one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have modified the teachings of Germeraad and Klenz regarding the measurement of business process variables, to include the step of providing a process input to control the output being measured, because it would have provided a predictable result by incorporating a feedback control loop. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the advantages of incorporating Fowler's teachings because it would have provided a way to correct the variable being measured.

***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. .

The integrative facilities of organizational systems applied to the core corporation  
Ronald T Sones. Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal.  
Morehead: Fall 2000. Vol. 18, Iss. 2; pg. 25, 15 pgs

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan G. Sterrett whose telephone number is 571-272-6881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on 571-272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JGS 1-6-2009

/Jonathan G. Sterrett/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623

